arXiv:1601.06271v2 [math.AP] 3 Feb 2016

Minimisers of the Allen-Cahn equation on hyperbolic graphs

Blaž Mramor

University of Freiburg, Germany.

Abstract

We investigate minimal solutions of the Allen-Cahn equation on a Gromov-hyperbolic graph. Under some natural conditions on the graph, we show the existence of non-constant uniformly-bounded minimal solutions with prescribed asymptotic behaviours. For a phase field model on a hyperbolic graph, such solutions describe energy-minimising steady-state phase transitions that converge towards prescribed phases given by the asymptotic directions on the graph.

1 Introduction

1.1 Setting and results

We are interested in the Allen-Cahn equation on an infinite connected graph $\Gamma = (G, E)$, where G is the set of vertices and E the set of edges. We assume that Γ is locally uniformly bounded and that it furthermore satisfies the following conditions. (For precise statements see section 2.) By setting the length of edges to 1 and denoting by d the geodesic distance, (Γ, d) is a geodesically complete unbounded metric space and we assume that it is δ-hyperbolic in the sense of Gromov. The space (Γ, d) can be then compactified by adding the *boundary at infinity* $\partial\Gamma$, where the points in $\partial\Gamma$ are equivalence classes of geodesic rays. We assume that there exists a vertex $v \in G$, such that every point is uniformly close to a geodesic ray from v. Finally, we assume that Γ satisfies a particular isoperimetric condition of exponent smaller than one (given by (IP) in section 2.2), which controls the local growth of the space.

To describe the Allen-Cahn equation, let $V : \mathtt{R} \to \mathtt{R}$ be a C^2 double-well potential, and more precisely, assume that V has two consecutive non-degenerate absolute minima $c_0, c_1 \in \mathtt{R}$. A typical example is $V(s) := (1 - s^2)^2$. Denote for every function $x : G \to \mathtt{R}$ the discrete Laplace operator by

$$\Delta_g(x) := \sum_{d(\tilde{g},g)=1} (x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g) \ .$$

The Allen-Cahn equation is then given by

$$\Delta_g(x) - V'(x_g) = 0, \text{ for all } \ g \in G. \tag{AC}$$

The equation (AC) comes with a variational structure given by the formal action functional

$$W(x) := \sum_{g\in G} \left(\frac{1}{4} \sum_{d(\tilde{g},g)=1} (x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g)^2 + V(x_g) \right) = \sum_{g\in G} \left(\frac{1}{4} |\nabla_g(x)|^2 + V(x_g) \right), \tag{W}$$

which has a well defined gradient $\nabla_g(W(x)) = \Delta_g(x) - V'(x_g)$ (see also section 3). As is usual in the calculus of variation, we call an entire solution $x : G \to \mathtt{R}$ of (AC) a global minimiser, if it minimises the action (W) globally, i.e., if for every finitely supported variation $\tilde{x} : G \to \mathtt{R}$ of x

$$W(x + \tilde{x}) \geq W(x).$$

The goal of this paper is to construct a large class of uniformly bounded global minimisers of (AC), which have prescribed asymptotic behaviour, tending to either c_0 or c_1 along infinite geodesic rays in G. To state our result, we note that with respect to a visual metric (explained in section 2.1) $\partial\Gamma$ and $\Gamma \cup \partial\Gamma$ are compact metric spaces. We prove the so-called *minimal Dirichlet problem at infinity* (c.f. definition 3.7):

Theorem (Existence of asymptotically defined minimizers). *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \partial\Gamma$ be such that $\overline{D_0 \cup D_1} = \partial\Gamma$, $\mathring{D}_0 \cap \mathring{D}_1 = \varnothing$ and $\overline{\mathring{D}_j} = D_j$ for $j \in \{0,1\}$. Then there exists a global minimizer x, such that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and $j \in \{0,1\}$ there exists an open set $\mathcal{O}_j \subset \Gamma \cup \partial\Gamma$ (with respect to the topology induced by the visual metric), such that $\mathring{D}_j \subset \mathcal{O}_j$ and such that for every $g \in G \cap \mathcal{O}_j$,*

$$|x_g - c_j| \leq \varepsilon.$$

1.2 Discussion

The Allen-Cahn equation first appeared in the study of phase field models on $\mathtt{R}^2$ and in geometry via its connection to minimal hyperplanes due to de Giorgi. In both cases one is interested in minimal solutions. In general, two obvious global minimisers of (AC) exist, namely, $x \equiv c_0$ and $x \equiv c_1$. We are interested in describing the set of global minimisers that are trapped between the graphs of c_0 and c_1 and asymptotically connect them.

The focus on finding minimal solutions and not general solutions is on one hand driven by physical motivation of energy-minimising states in the phase field models, and on the other hand by the work on de Giorgi's conjecture, relating minimal solutions to minimal hypersurfaces. Another reason to focus on global minimisers and not general solutions is the observation that when the potential term is asymptotically large, and Γ is a Cayley graph of a hyperbolic group, one can easily find a wealth of solutions via a version of the implicit function theorem (see [20]), while the existence of non-trivial global minimisers is not so clear.

Intuitively, one expects to have many more such global minimisers on hyperbolic spaces than in spaces with polynomial growth. This is specifically motivated by the Laplace equation, the prototypical case of a variational elliptic problem where all solutions (harmonic functions) are global minimisers. In the setting of Gromov-hyperbolic metric spaces of various generality a class of non-constant entire harmonic functions can be constructed by solving the corresponding Dirichlet problem at infinity given by a regular-enough function on the boundary at infinity (see [2, 8, 16, 23]). This is in stark contrast to the Euclidean setting, where all entire harmonic functions are constant. In the literature dealing with the hyperbolic case mostly non-variational methods have been used, namely, either Perron's method of barriers (see [3, 8, 16]), or probabilistic methods (as in [2, 11, 22, 23]). Both methods are not applicable to (AC).

For hyperbolic manifolds with constant sectional curvature similar results to those presented in this paper have been obtained by Pisante and Ponsiglione in [21], by Birindelli and Mazzeo in [4], and by Mazzeo and Saez in [19]. In their proofs the symmetry of the hyperbolic space plays a crucial role and allows them to reduce the PDE to an ODE. Other existence results about minimisers for more general nonlinear variational elliptic operators on quite general groups have been discussed in [7, 18], but they discuss minimisers on the abelianisation of the group, which are not necessarily global minimisers of the group itself, moreover, they are highly irregular at the boundary at infinity.

A variational approach to solving (AC) on a Cayley graph of a hyperbolic group was developed by the author in [20]. There, the equivalent statement to the existence theorem above is proved when (AC) has the form $\rho\Delta_g(x) - V'(x_g) = 0$ with asymptotically small ρ (see [20, Theorem 4.14]). Even though a part of the construction of the proofs in this paper is similar to those in [20], a couple of serious technical difficulties needed to be overcome for this generalisation. The first and technically the most difficult problem was to move away from the perturbative case, that is, to drop the constant ρ from the equation. The estimate contained in lemma 3.10 is the most important part of the solution. Apart from that, we were able to isolate the exact conditions on the metric space, which are needed for the methodology to work. Accordingly, we were able to generalise the underlying space from Cayley graphs to general hyperbolic graphs satisfying the conditions mentioned in the first section of the introduction. Note that no symmetry of the space is assumed. In [20] it is

shown that by taking ρ to zero, the sets where the global minimisers transit from one phase c_j to the other, converge to a solution of an asymptotic Plateau problem. Applying the methods from [20] to hyperbolic graphs satisfying conditions introduced in this paper, solutions to the asymptotic Plateau problem can be constructed in an analogous way. We refrain, however, from presenting the complete argument in this text, since the non-perturbative setting developed in this paper is not optimal to deal with that problem directly.

Among the conditions on Γ, which we pose in this work, the isoperimetric inequality condition (IP) from section 2.2 is worth mentioning in this place. Namely, it is genuinely weaker than the strict linear isoperimetric inequality, which is usually posed or automatically satisfied in the literature that deals with the Dirichlet problem at infinity for the Laplace equation and its generalisations. More precisely, a strict linear isoperimetric inequality is satisfied on manifolds with negative-sectional curvature, and in other cases ([2, 11, 16]) the underlying metric space is assumed to satisfy a global Poincaré inequality, which is equivalent to it (see e.g. [15] about the equivalence).

1.3 Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Prof. V. Bangert for the helpful conversations and for his valuable comments.

2 Hyperbolic graphs

In this section we gather some basic facts about hyperbolic graphs and pose the necessary conditions. Let Γ denote an infinite connected graph with the vertex set G that is uniformly locally finite:

there exists an $S \in \mathbb{N}$, such that every vertex $v \in G$ joins to at most S edges.

By setting the length of the edges to one Γ becomes a metric space, where the metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ is defined as follows: for every two vertices $g, \tilde{g} \in G$, $d(g,\tilde{g})$ is the least length of a path in Γ connecting g and $\tilde{g}$. A curve $\gamma_{g,\tilde{g}}$ from g to $\tilde{g}$ of length $l(\gamma_{g,\tilde{g}}) = d(g,\tilde{g})$ is called a geodesic and needs not to be unique. It follows that the space (Γ, d) is an unbounded complete geodesic metric space, i.e. geodesics between any two points exist.

We assume that there is a constant $\delta > 0$, such that (Γ, d) is a δ-hyperbolic metric space in the sense of Gromov (as introduced in [13, 14]). Roughly put, this means that every geodesic triangle (i.e. a collection of three points $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$ together with three geodesics $\gamma_{g_1,g_2}, \gamma_{g_2,g_3}, \gamma_{g_3,g_1} \subset \Gamma$) is δ-slim (i.e. every geodesic "side" is in the δ-neighbourhood of the other two geodesic sides). There exists an extensive literature on the subject of Gromov hyperbolic spaces. For basic definitions and results, we refer the reader to [1, 10, 12]. Typical examples of δ-hyperbolic graphs are Cayley graphs of hyperbolic groups, such as fundamental groups of manifolds with strictly negative sectional curvature and free groups. Furthermore, hyperbolic graphs appear in network theory and mathematical biology.

2.1 Compactifying the graph

We shall briefly discuss the compactification of locally uniformly finite Gromov hyperbolic graphs in this section. For extensive overviews on this and related subjects we refer the reader to [6, 13, 17]. We shall provide more specific references along the way.

A geodesic ray is given by an isometry $\gamma : [0,\infty) \to \Gamma$, where $[0,\infty)$ is equipped with the standard metric. On δ-hyperbolic spaces, one may define an equivalence relation on the set of geodesic rays, by $\gamma_1 \sim \gamma_2$, if there exists a $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $d(\gamma_1(t), \gamma_2(t)) \leq C$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. One then defines the boundary at infinity $\partial\Gamma$ as the set of such equivalence classes of rays. Since Γ is assumed to be unbounded, $\partial\Gamma \neq \varnothing$. Defining $\overline{\Gamma} := \Gamma \cup \partial\Gamma$, we may extend any ray $\gamma \in \xi \in \partial\Gamma$ to $\gamma : [0,\infty] \to \overline{\Gamma}$, by defining $\gamma(\infty) = \xi$. It then holds that for every $g \in \Gamma$ and $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ there exists a geodesic ray $\gamma_{g,\xi} \subset \overline{\Gamma}$, such that $\gamma_{g,\xi}(0) = g$ and $\gamma_{g,\xi}(\infty) = \xi$. Moreover, for any two points $\xi, \mu \in \partial\Gamma$ there exists an (infinite) geodesic $\gamma_{\xi,\mu} \subset \overline{\Gamma}$, connecting these two points at infinity, i.e. the ray $\gamma_{\xi,\mu}|_{[0,-\infty)}$ belongs to the equivalence class ξ and $\gamma_{\xi,\mu}|_{[0,\infty)}$ to μ. With these definitions, geodesic triangles in $\overline{\Gamma}$ are also $\tilde{\delta}$ slim for a uniform constant $\tilde{\delta}$.

For the remainder of this text, let us assume that there exists a base-vertex $v \in G$ and a constant $\bar{\delta} > 0$, such that Γ is $\bar{\delta}$-*visual* from v. More precisely, let us define for every $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ the set $\xi_v \subset G$ by

$$\xi_v := \bigcup_{\gamma=\gamma_{v,\xi}} (\gamma \cap G). \tag{2.1}$$

We assume then that for every vertex $g \in G$ there exists a $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$, such that

$$d(g, \xi_v) \leq \bar{\delta}. \tag{2.2}$$

For simplicity, we redefine δ as the maximum of $\tilde{\delta}, \bar{\delta}$ and δ.

Denote for every $g \in G$ its distance to the base vertex v by $|g| := d(v, g)$. The so-called *visual metric* makes $\overline{\Gamma}$ into a bounded geodesic metric space. It is defined for every $y, \tilde{y} \in \Gamma$ by

$$d_\varepsilon(y, \tilde{y}) := \inf_{p_{y,\tilde{y}}} \int_0^{l(p_{y,\tilde{y}})} e^{-\varepsilon \cdot d(v, p_{y,\tilde{y}}(s))} ds \ ,$$

where $p_{y,\tilde{y}} \subset \Gamma$ is a path from y to $\tilde{y}$. Let $\xi, \mu \in \partial\Gamma$ and let $y \in \gamma_1$ where $[\gamma_1] = \xi$ and $\tilde{y} \in \gamma_2$ where $[\gamma_2] = \mu$. It follows from δ-hyperbolicity that there exists an $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, the limit of $d_\varepsilon(y, \tilde{y})$ for $|y|, |\tilde{y}| \to \infty$ is uniformly bounded and that it depends only on the equivalence classes ξ and μ. This gives us for every $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ a metric on $\overline{\Gamma}$, for which there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$, such that for all $\xi, \mu \in \partial\Gamma$ and every infinite geodesic $\gamma_{\xi,\mu}$

$$\lambda^{-1} e^{-\varepsilon d(o, \gamma_{\xi,\mu})} \leq d_\varepsilon(\xi, \mu) \leq \lambda e^{-\varepsilon d(o, \gamma_{\xi,\mu})}. \tag{2.3}$$

Let us fix such an $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ for the rest of this paper.

For every $n \in \mathtt{N}$ we denote metric balls in G by

$$\mathcal{B}_n := \{g \in G \mid |g| \leq n\} \ \text{ and } \ \mathcal{B}_n(g_0) := \{g \in G \mid d(g_0, g) \leq n\},$$

and we denote balls of radius $r > 0$ in $\partial\Gamma$, or in $G \cup \partial\Gamma$ with respect to the visual metric by

$$B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0) := \{\xi \in \partial\Gamma \mid d_\varepsilon(\xi_0, \xi) \leq r\} \subset \partial\Gamma,$$
$$\mathcal{B}_r^\varepsilon(y_0) := \{y \in G \cup \partial\Gamma \mid d_\varepsilon(y_0, y) \leq r\} \subset G \cup \partial\Gamma,$$

where $\xi_0 \in \partial\Gamma$ and $y_0 \in G \cup \partial\Gamma$. For $\mathcal{D} \subset G \subset \Gamma$ we denote by $\#\mathcal{D}$ the number of vertices contained in $\mathcal{D}$. Then

$$\#\mathcal{B}_n \leq S^n + S^{n-1} + \cdots + S + 1 = \frac{S^{n+1} - 1}{S - 1}$$

and with the visual metric, we can obviously find constants $D > 0$, $C_D > 0$, such that

$$\#\mathcal{B}_n \leq C_D e^{\varepsilon n D}. \tag{2.4}$$

A natural question arises of what is the optimal constant $D > 0$ for a specific graph Γ satisfying the given conditions. This is in our setting especially important, since D also comes up in the isoperimetric condition (IP) below. A more involved estimate, stated in the proposition below, can be obtained in terms of the Assouad dimension $d_A(\partial\Gamma)$ of the metric space $(\partial\Gamma, d^\varepsilon)$, which is in our case finite (see [5]) and might provide a better estimate in specific cases. A more thorough discussion about the Assouad dimension and the proof of the following statement are contained in the appendix A.

Proposition 2.1 (Growth of balls)**.** *For every $D > d_A(\partial\Gamma)$ there exists a constant $C_D > 0$, such that for every $n \in \mathtt{N}$,*

$$\#\mathcal{B}_n \leq C_D e^{\varepsilon D n}.$$

2.2 Boundaries of sets and the isoperimetric profile

Let us define for a set $\mathcal{B} \subset G$ its "outer" set by $\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}} := \{g \in G \ | d(g, \mathcal{B}) \leq 1\}$ and its "inner" set $\mathcal{B}^{\text{in}}$ by $(\mathcal{B}^{\text{in}})^{\text{out}} = \mathcal{B}$. Furthermore, we define the outer and the inner boundaries of $\mathcal{B}$ by $\partial^{\text{out}}\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}^{\text{out}} \backslash \mathcal{B}$ and $\partial^{\text{in}}\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B} \backslash \mathcal{B}^{\text{in}}$ and the "full" boundary by $\partial^{\text{f}}\mathcal{B} := \partial^{\text{out}}\mathcal{B} \cup \partial^{\text{in}}\mathcal{B}$. It easily follows that

$$\partial^{\text{out}}(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{D}) = (\partial^{\text{out}}\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\text{out}}) \cup (\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}} \cap \partial^{\text{out}}\mathcal{D}) \tag{2.5}$$

for any two set $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D} \subset G$.

Recall that the concept of Gromov hyperbolicity allows graphs such as the Cayley graph of $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}$. However, a fundamental difference in the classes of solutions to PDEs on geometric spaces appears between spaces of polynomial vs. exponential growth. We shall thus need to put an extra condition on our space, which will ensure the minimal required local growth properties of G. It comes in the form of an isoperimetric inequality.

Let $D > 0$ be as in (2.4) and assume that there exists a constant $C_0 \geq 1$, such that for every $B \subset G \subset \Gamma$ the following *isoperimetric inequality* holds:

$$C_0 \#(\partial^{\text{out}} B) \geq (\#B)^{\left(\frac{4D}{4D+1}\right)}. \tag{IP}$$

Remark 2.2. As explained in the paragraph containing (2.4), Gromov hyperbolicity together with local uniform boundedness of Γ give an upper bound on its growth. The (IP) condition, on the other hand ensures a lower growth bound on (all subsets of) Γ. In particular, it ensures that there are no isolated (equivalence classes of) rays in $\partial\Gamma$ and is equivalent to a global Poincaré inequality (see [15]).

Note that (IP) holds for hyperbolic groups, for which there exist constants $\alpha > 0$ and $\tilde{C} > 0$, such that for every $B \subset G \subset \Gamma$

$$\tilde{C} \#(\partial^{\text{out}} B) \geq \frac{\#B}{\log(\alpha(\#B))}.$$

This statement can be found e.g. in [11].

2.3 Shadows and cones

We adapt the definition of a shadow from the setting of hyperbolic groups (due to Coornaert and Sullivan [9, 22]).

Definition 2.3. For every $g \in G$ we define the shadow of g by

$$S(g) := \{\xi \in \partial\Gamma \mid d(g, \xi_v) \leq \delta\} \subset \partial\Gamma.$$

Clearly, for every $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$ there exists a $g \in G$ with $\xi \in S(g)$ and since Γ is visual, $S(g) \neq \varnothing$ for any $g \in G$.

Remark 2.4. If Γ is a Cayley graph of a hyperbolic group, the definition of a shadow in [9, 22] requires a much larger distance from the point g. There, shadows can be used together with the automaton structure and the quasi-conformal action of the group on its boundary to obtain useful concepts of measure and dimension of the boundary at infinity (see [10, 20]). One step in the proofs that can be applied also to a graph like Γ is the following proposition, which states that shadows are "almost round". The proof is analogous to [20, Proposition 2.3].

Proposition 2.5. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for every $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$, $r > 0$ and $g_1, g_2 \in \xi_v \subset G$,*

$$B_r^\varepsilon(\xi) \subset S(g_1) \quad \text{if} \quad C_1 e^{-\varepsilon|g_1|} \geq r \text{ and}$$
$$S(g_2) \subset B_r^\varepsilon(\xi) \quad \text{if} \quad C_1^{-1} e^{-\varepsilon|g_2|} \leq r.$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for every $g \in G$ and $\xi \in S(g)$,

$$S(g) \subset B_r^\varepsilon(\xi) \quad \text{if} \quad r \geq C_2 e^{-\varepsilon|g|}.$$

Proof. Let $\xi, \eta \in \partial\Gamma$, $r > 0$ and let $d_\varepsilon(\xi, \eta) < r$. Denote by $\gamma_{\xi,\eta}$ a geodesic that connects ξ to η in Γ. Then by (2.3)

$$\lambda^{-1} e^{-\varepsilon d(\gamma_{\xi,\eta}, v)} \leq d_\varepsilon(\xi, \eta) \leq r.$$

Let $g_1 \in \xi_v$ with $\lambda^{-1} e^{-\varepsilon(|g_1|+\delta)} \geq r$. Since geodesic triangles in $\overline{\Gamma}$ are δ-slim, it follows that $d(g_1, \eta_v) \leq \delta$ and so $\eta \in S(g_1)$ which proves the first inclusion.

The second inclusion follows via a similar proof.

Let $\xi, \eta \in S(g)$ and choose points $g_\xi \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(g) \cap \xi_v$ and $g_\eta \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(g) \cap \eta_v$. By the triangle inequality

$$d_\varepsilon(\xi, \eta) \leq d_\varepsilon(\xi, g_\xi) + d_\varepsilon(g_\xi, g_\eta) + d_\varepsilon(g_\eta, \eta).$$

Since $g_\xi, g_\eta \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(g)$, $d(g_\xi, g_\eta) \leq 2\delta$ and it follows that $d(v, \gamma_{g_\xi, g_\eta}) \leq |g| - 2\delta$ and by (2.3) that

$$d_\varepsilon(\xi, \eta) \leq \lambda e^{-\varepsilon|g_\xi|} + \lambda e^{-\varepsilon(|g|-2\delta)} + \lambda e^{-\varepsilon|g_\eta|} \leq 3\lambda e^{2\delta} e^{-\varepsilon|g|}.$$

□

Using shadows, we can now define a topology on G, as in [20].

Definition 2.6. For a set $U \subset \partial\Gamma$ define the *U-cone* by

$$\mathcal{C}_U := \{g \in G \mid S(g) \subset U\}.$$

Furthermore, we define the *cone topology* on G as the topology generated by balls $\mathcal{B}_n(g_0)$ and truncated cones $C_{B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_n$.

In its essence, the cone topology defined above is similar to the cone topology on manifolds with pinched negative sectional curvature (see e.g. [8]). The following statement is essentially proved in [20, lemma 2.6], even though shadows are defined in a slightly different way there. The proof, however, is only based on the fact that shadows are almost-round as stated in proposition 2.5 (c.f. [20, proposition 2.1]).

Lemma 2.7. *The cone-topology from definition 2.6 is equivalent to the topology induced by the visual metric.*

For the remainder of this section, we shall focus on U-cones, where U is a metric ball at infinity.

In definition 2.6 we associate to every $g \in \mathcal{C}_{B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)}$ the set of points $S(g) \subset B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)$. On the other hand, we shall find it useful to associate to every $\xi \in B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)$ the set

$$\mathcal{U}_\xi := \{g \in G \mid d(g, \xi_v) \leq \delta\}.$$

Lemma 2.8. *Let C_1 be as in proposition 2.5. If $g \in \mathcal{U}_\xi$ for some $\xi \in B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)$ with $d_\varepsilon(\xi, \xi_0) < r - C_1 e^{-\varepsilon|g|}$, then $g \in \mathcal{C}_{B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)}$.*

Proof. By proposition 2.5 $S(g) \subset B^\varepsilon_{C_1 e^{-\varepsilon|g|}}(\xi)$ for every $\xi \in S(g)$. So if $g \in \mathcal{U}_\xi$ for a ξ with $d_\varepsilon(\xi, \xi_0) < r - C_1 e^{-\varepsilon|g|}$, then

$$S(g) \subset B^\varepsilon_{C_1 e^{-\varepsilon|g|}}(\xi) \subset B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)$$

and so $g \in \mathcal{C}_{B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0)}$. □

To conclude this section we prove a somewhat technical statement about estimating the boundaries of cones with annuli at infinity. Define an annulus by

$$A_r^t(\xi_0) := \overline{(B_{r+t}(\xi_0) \backslash B_{r-t}(\xi_0))} \subset \partial\Gamma$$

and denote for a set $\mathcal{D} \subset G$, the n-times iterated inner set $(\dots((\mathcal{D})^{\text{in}})^{\text{in}}\dots)^{\text{in}}$ by $\mathcal{D}^{(n\,\text{in})}$ and similarly the n-times iterated outer set $\mathcal{D}^{(n\,\text{out})}$.

Lemma 2.9. *Define for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the number $t_n := \max\{4\varepsilon^{-1}e^{\varepsilon 4}, C_2\}e^{-\varepsilon n}$ and for every $r \geq 0$ the set*

$$\mathcal{A}_{r,t_n} := \{g \in \mathcal{U}_\xi \backslash \mathcal{B}_n \mid \xi \in A^{t_n}_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)\}.$$

Then

$$\partial^{\text{f}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)})^{(3\,\text{out})} \subset \mathcal{A}_{r,t_n} \cup \mathcal{B}_n \quad \text{and} \quad \partial^{\text{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)} \subset \mathcal{A}_{r,t_n} \cup \mathcal{B}_n.$$

Moreover, $(\mathcal{A}_{r,t_n} \cap \mathcal{A}_{r+4t_n,t_n}) \backslash \mathcal{B}_n = \varnothing$.

Proof. Let $g \in (\partial^{\text{f}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)})^{(3\,\text{out})} \backslash \mathcal{B}_n) \cup (\partial^{\text{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_n)$. Then there exist a $\xi \in \Gamma \backslash B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)$ with $g \in \mathcal{U}_\xi \backslash \mathcal{B}_n$ and a vertex $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{n-4}$ such that $d(g, \tilde{g}) \leq 4$. It holds that $S(\tilde{g}) \subset B^\varepsilon_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0)$ and it follows by the definition of the visual metric and a short calculation for every $\eta \in S(\tilde{g})$ that

$$d_\varepsilon(\xi, \eta) \leq d_\varepsilon(\xi, g) + d_\varepsilon(g, \tilde{g}) + d_\varepsilon(\tilde{g}, \eta) \leq 4\varepsilon^{-1}e^{-\varepsilon(n-4)} \leq t_n,$$

so $\xi \in A^{t_n}_{r+2t_n}$.

To show the disjointness, let $g \in \mathcal{U}_\xi \backslash \mathcal{B}_n$ for a ray $\xi \in A^{t_n}_{r+2t_n}$. Then it holds for all rays η with $g \in \mathcal{U}_\eta \backslash \mathcal{B}_n$ that $\eta \in S(g)$ and by proposition 2.5 it follows that $d_\varepsilon(\xi, \eta) \leq C_2 e^{-\varepsilon n} < t_n$. Because of the strict inequality $\eta \in \mathring{A}^{2t_n}_{r+2t_n}$ and so $g \notin \mathcal{A}_{r+4t_n,t_n}$. □

3 The variational problem

As explained in the introduction, we are interested in solutions $x : G \to \mathtt{R}$ of the discrete Allen-Cahn equation (AC), given by

$$\Delta_g(x) - V'(x_g) = 0, \text{ for all } \ g \in G,$$

where $V : \mathtt{R} \to \mathtt{R}$ is a C^2 double-well potential. More precisely, we assume that V is a C^2 function with two non-degenerate consecutive minima $c_0, c_1 \in \mathtt{R}$. We assume without loss of generality, by adding a constant to V if necessary, that $V(c_0) = V(c_1) = 0$.

3.1 Minimal solutions

For any finite (compact) set $\mathcal{B} \subset G$ and function $x : G \to \mathtt{R}$, the "truncated action functional" is defined similarly as in (W) by

$$W_{\mathcal{B}}(x) := \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\frac{1}{4} |\nabla_g(x)|^2 + V(x_g) \right). \tag{3.6}$$

The function $W_{\mathcal{B}}(x)$ is then a function of variables x_g where $g \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}$ and x solves (AC) for all $g \in \mathcal{B}^{\text{in}}$, if for every perturbation y supported on $\mathcal{B}^{\text{in}}$,

$$\frac{d}{ds}\bigg|_{s=0} W_B(x + sy) = 0.$$

This motivates the following definition.

Definition 3.1. For any set $\mathcal{B} \subset G$, a function $x : G \to \mathtt{R}$ is called *a minimiser on* $\mathcal{B}$, if

$$W_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}}(x + y) - W_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}}(x) \geq 0$$

for all $y : G \to \mathtt{R}$ with compact support in $\mathcal{B}$.

This definition makes sense also for infinite sets $\mathcal{B}$, because the support of y is compact, since one may evaluate the difference above by truncating the actions to a bounded set containing the support of y in its interior. The function x is called a *global minimiser*, if x is a minimiser on G.

Observe that with this definition, a minimiser x on a compact set $\mathcal{B}$ is a solution to the Dirichlet problem given by (AC) on $\mathcal{B}$, with given boundary values $x|_{(\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}} \setminus \mathcal{B}}$. Such minimisers exist:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{B} \subset G$ be a compact set and let $f : (\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}} \setminus \mathcal{B} \to \mathtt{R}$ be given. Then there exists a minimiser x of (3.6) on $\mathcal{B}$, with boundary values given by f, that is $x|_{(\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}} \setminus \mathcal{B}} = f$.*

Proof. Since V is non-negative $\tilde{m} := \inf_x W_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}}(x) \geq 0$ holds and because $\mathcal{B}$ is finite, $\tilde{m} < \infty$. Let x^n be a sequence such that $x^n|_{(\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}} \setminus \mathcal{B}} = f$ and $\lim_n W_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}}(x^n) = \tilde{m}$. Since $W_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}}(x^n) \to \infty$ if for any $g \in \mathcal{B}$ and $s \in S$, $(x^n_{gs} - x^n_g) \to \pm\infty$, it follows that there exists a constant $K > 0$ and an $N \in \mathtt{N}$, so that for all $n \geq N$ and all $g \in \mathcal{B}$, $|x^n_g - x^n_{gs}| \leq K$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is finite, by local uniform finiteness of Γ also $(\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}}$ is, and so for all $g \in \mathcal{B}$ and $n \geq N$, $|x^n_g| \leq C := K(\max_g f(g))\#\mathcal{B}$. Hence, x^n are contained in a compact set and thus due to continuity of $W_{\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}}}$ converge to a minimiser x^∞ satisfying the boundary conditions given by f. □

Remark 3.3. It is easy to see that the constant function $x^{c_0} \equiv c_0$ and $x^{c_1} \equiv c_1$ are global minimisers of (3.6).

Obviously, all global minimisers are solutions and it is clear that one may construct global minimisers as limits of minimisers on compact domains that exhaust G. More precisely, if $\mathcal{B}^n$ is a sequence of compact subsets exhausting G and x^n a sequence of minimisers on $\mathcal{B}^n$ which converges to a function x^∞, then x^∞ is a global minimiser.

The following two lemmas are standard for elliptic difference operators. For proofs, see [20], [7] or [18].

Lemma 3.4. *For functions x, y, their point-wise minimum and maximum $m := \min\{x, y\}$ and $M := \max\{x, y\}$, and for any compact domain $\mathcal{B} \subset G$ it holds that*

$$W_{\mathcal{B}}(x) + W_{\mathcal{B}}(y) \geq W_{\mathcal{B}}(M) + W_{\mathcal{B}}(m).$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let x, y be two minimisers on $\mathcal{B}$ with $x_g \leq y_g$ for all $g \in (\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}} \backslash \mathcal{B}$. Then either $x_g < y_g$ for all $g \in \mathcal{B}$, or $x|_{\mathcal{B}} \equiv y|_{\mathcal{B}}$.*

In particular, any two global minimisers x, y with $x_g \leq y_g$ for all $g \in G$ and such that $x \neq y$, are totally ordered: $x_g < y_g$ for all $g \in G$.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $f : (\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}} \backslash \mathcal{B} \to [c_0, c_1]$ be given. Then it holds for every minimiser x on $\mathcal{B}$ satisfying the boundary conditions given by f that $c_0 \leq x_g \leq c_1$ for all $g \in (\mathcal{B}^{\text{out}})^{\text{out}}$.*

3.2 Minimal Dirichlet problem at infinity

We wish to construct global minimisers that solve the minimal Dirichlet problem at infinity as given in the following definition.

Definition 3.7. Endow $G \cup \partial\Gamma$ with the topology induced by the visual metric (which is by lemma 2.7 equivalent to the cone topology from definition 2.6). Given two sets $D_0, D_1 \subset \partial\Gamma$ with $\overline{\mathring{D}_0} = D_0$ and $\overline{\mathring{D}_1} = D_1$, such that $\mathring{D}_0 \cap \mathring{D}_1 = \varnothing$ and $\overline{D_0} \cup \overline{D_1} = \partial\Gamma$, we say that a global minimiser x solves the minimal Dirichlet problem at infinity for the equation (3.6) on D_0 and D_1, if the following holds.

For every $\xi \in \mathring{D}_j$ with $j \in \{0, 1\}$ and for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an open neighbourhood $\mathcal{O}_\xi \subset G \cup \partial\Gamma$ of ξ, such that for all $g \in G \cap \mathcal{O}_\xi$, $|x_g - c_j| < \epsilon$.

In the following proposition, we shall construct a global minimiser as a limit of local minimisers x^N on balls $\mathcal{B}_N$ with growing radii $N \in \mathtt{N}$, using the concept of the cone from definition 2.6. The difficult part, which the rest of the paper is then devoted to, deals with the asymptotics of such a global minimiser.

From here on we shall focus on the asymptotics of x^N in D_1, i.e. we aim to show that if $\xi \in \mathring{D}_1$ and x^N a sequence of such local minimizers, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ we may find a small neighbourhood of ξ in $G \cup \partial\Gamma$, such that for all g in this neighbourhood and for all large enough N, $|x^N_g - c_1| < \varepsilon$. To get the final statement we note that modulo some trivial reformulations of the conditions, the roles of c_0 and c_1 may be swapped on every stage of the discussion below.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $c_0 < c_1$ be the two distinct absolute minima of V and let $D_0, D_1 \subset \partial\Gamma$ be as in definition 3.7. Define a function $\tilde{x}$ by*

$$\tilde{x}_g := \begin{cases} c_1 & \text{if } g \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathring{D}_1}, \\ c_0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

For every $N \in \mathtt{N}$, let $x^N : G \to \mathtt{R}$ be a minimiser on $\mathcal{B}_N$, such that $x^N|_{(\mathcal{B}_N)^c} \equiv \tilde{x}|_{(\mathcal{B}_N)^c}$. Then, as $N \to \infty$, x^N converge along a subsequence to a global minimiser $\bar{x}$ of (AC).

Proof. By lemma 3.2 such a minimizer x^N exists and by lemma 3.5, $c_0 \leq x^N_g \leq c_1$ for all $N \in \mathtt{N}$ and all $g \in G$. By Tychonov's theorem $[c_0, c_1]^G$ is a compact space w.r.t. pointwise convergence, so x^N has a convergent subsequence $x^{N_k} \to \bar{x}$, which is then a global minimiser. □

3.3 Minimal solutions and boundaries of sets

In this section we investigate some less standard properties of minimal solutions on a set $\mathcal{B}$ with boundary values from the set $[c_0, c_1]$. Before proceeding with the analysis, we state the following simple proposition that quantifies the behaviour of V around the absolute minima c_0 and c_1.

Proposition 3.9. *There exist constants $\rho_0, m_1 > 0$ and $b \geq 1$, such that $4b\rho_0 \leq c_1 - c_0$ and such that it holds for all $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$:*

(a) On $[c_1 - 2b\rho, c_1]$ is V' a monotone increasing negative function, bounded from above by $m_1(y - c_1) \geq V'(y)$.

(b) $V(c_0 + y) \geq V(c_1 - b^{-1}y)$ for all $y \in [0, 2b\rho]$.

(c) For every $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$ there exists a $\beta > 0$, such that for all $y \in [c_0 + 2b\rho, c_1 - 2b\rho]$

$$V(y) \geq \max\{V(c_0 + b\rho), V(c_1 - b\rho)\} + \beta.$$

(d) There exists a $\tilde{\rho} > 0$ with $\tilde{\rho} < c_1 - c_0 - 2b\rho$ such that $V(c_0 + \tilde{\rho}) = V(c_1 - 2b\rho)$ and such that for all $y \in [c_0 + \tilde{\rho}, c_1 - 2b\rho]$, $V(y) \geq V(c_0 + \tilde{\rho})$. Moreover, $2b\rho \leq (c_1 - c_0 - 2b\rho - \tilde{\rho})$.

Proof. Parts (a) and (b) follow from the non-degenericity condition on c_0 and c_1 and Taylor's theorem. Part (c) follows from the fact that $c_0, c_1 \in \mathtt{R}$ are consecutive absolute minima and part (d) from both, Taylor's theorem and the fact that there are no other absolute minima in $[c_0, c_1]$. □

For the remainder of this section, let x be a minimiser on a finite set $\mathcal{B}$, satisfying the boundary conditions given by a function $f : \Gamma \backslash \mathcal{B} \to [c_0, c_1]$. For $\underline{c} < \overline{c} \in [c_0, c_1]$ define the interval sets

$$\mathcal{B}^{(\underline{c}, \overline{c})} := \{g \in \mathcal{B} \subset G \mid x_g \in (\underline{c}, \overline{c})\}$$

and analogously for half-open and closed intervals from $\underline{c}$ to $\overline{c}$. Furthermore, define for $x : G \to \mathtt{R}$, $c \in \mathtt{R}$ and a set $\mathcal{D} \subset G$ the function

$$P_{\mathcal{D}}(x, c) := \sum_{g \in \mathcal{D}} \Big(V(x_g) - V(c) \Big).$$

The following lemma gives an essential estimate, which combined with (IP) and the growth bound (2.4) gives us the main lemma bellow (i.e. lemma 4.3).

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\mathcal{D} \subset G$ be a subset, the constants ρ, b and m_1 as in proposition 3.9, and let x be a minimiser on a finite set $\mathcal{B}$, satisfying the boundary conditions given by a function $f : G \backslash \mathcal{B} \to [c_0, c_1]$. Define $\mathcal{B}^l := \mathcal{B}^{[c_0, c_1 - 2b\rho)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^h := \mathcal{B}^{[c_1 - 2b\rho, c_1 - \rho)}$. Then there exist a constant $k_0 > 0$, such that*

$$\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap \mathcal{D}^{(2\,\mathrm{in})}) + P_{\mathcal{B}^h \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x, c_1 - \rho) \leq k_0 \Big(\#(\mathcal{B}^l \cap \partial^{\mathrm{f}} \mathcal{D}) + P_{\mathcal{B}^h \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}} \mathcal{D}}(x, c_1 - \rho) \Big).$$

Proof. Consider the following variation of x:

$$\tilde{x}_g^{\mathcal{D}} := \begin{cases} c_1 - \rho & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0 + \rho b, c_1 - \rho)} \cap \mathcal{D}, \\ c_1 - b^{-1}(x_g - c_0) & \text{for } g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0, c_0 + \rho b)} \cap \mathcal{D}, \\ x_g & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

for which $\mathrm{supp}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}} - x) \subset \mathcal{B}^{[c_0, c_1 - \rho)} \cap \mathcal{D}$ holds.

Define $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} := (\mathcal{B}^{[c_0, c_1 - \rho)} \cap \mathcal{D})^{\mathrm{out}}$. We split the proof of this lemma in three parts, each worked out below. In part 1, we will show that

$$W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) \geq 0. \tag{3.7}$$

Since x is a minimiser, $W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(x) \geq 0$, so by writing

$$W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \backslash \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \backslash \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) = W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}}(x) + W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}),$$

we notice that

$$W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \backslash \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \backslash \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) \geq W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}})$$

follows from (3.7). Let us write $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ as the disjoint union $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = (\mathcal{B}^l \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}}) \cup (\mathcal{B}^h \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}})$ and trivially estimate

$$W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) \geq W_{\partial^{\mathrm{in}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\partial^{\mathrm{in}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) + \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}^h \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}} (V(x_g) - V(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}})).$$

In the second part of the proof below we show that there exists a positive constant $\tilde{k}_1$, such that

$$W_{\partial^{\mathrm{in}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\partial^{\mathrm{in}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) \geq \tilde{k}_1 \#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap (\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}})^{\mathrm{in}}). \tag{3.8}$$

To obtain this estimate, no terms $V(x_g)$ with $g \in \mathcal{B}^h \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$ were involved, so it follows since $\tilde{k}_1 \leq 1$ that

$$W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) \geq \tilde{k}_1 \Big(\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}} \mathcal{B}^l \cap (\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}})^{\mathrm{in}}) + \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}^h \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}} (V(x_g) - V(c_1 - \rho)) \Big).$$

In the third part below, we prove that there exists a positive constant $\tilde{k}_2$, such that

$$\tilde{k}_2\Big(\#(\mathcal{B}^l \cap \partial^{\mathrm{f}}\mathcal{D}) + \sum_{g\in\mathcal{B}^h\cap\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}} (V(x_g) - V(c_1-\rho))\Big) \geq W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x).$$

Part 1:
Part (b) of proposition 3.9 implies that $V(c_1 - b^{-1}(x_g - c_0)) \leq V(x_g)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_0+\rho b]}$. Moreover, since $V(c_1-\rho) \leq V(c_0+b\rho)$, it follows from parts (a) and (c) of the same proposition that $V(x_g) \geq V(c_1-\rho)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0+\rho b, c_1-\rho)}$. Together this gives

$$V(x_g) \geq V(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g) \text{ for all } g \in G. \tag{3.9}$$

Next, we prove that for all $g \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$,

$$|\nabla_g(x)|^2 \geq |\nabla_g(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}})|^2. \tag{3.10}$$

Indeed, it holds for all $g \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$ and $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}_1(g)$ that $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{D}$, and it is enough to show that for all pairs $(g,\tilde{g}) \in \mathcal{D}\times\mathcal{D}$ with $d(g,\tilde{g})=1$, $(x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g)^2 \geq (\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}} - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g)^2$. To show this, we do a case study.

- First, observe that this inequality is obviously satisfied in the case where $g,\tilde{g} \in (\mathcal{B}^{[c_0+\rho b, c_1-\rho)} \cup \mathcal{B}^{[c_1-\rho,c_1]}) \cap \mathcal{D}$, and since $b \geq 1$ also when $g,\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_0+\rho b)} \cap \mathcal{D}$.
- In case that $g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_0+\rho b)} \cap \mathcal{D}$ and $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0+\rho b, c_1-\rho)} \cap \mathcal{D}$, the definition of $\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}$ gives us $b^{-1}(x_g - c_0) = c_1 - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g$ and $c_1 - b^{-1}(x_{\tilde{g}} - c_0) \geq c_1 - \rho = \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}}$, so

  $$(x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g) \geq b^{-1}(x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g) \geq (c_1 - b^{-1}(x_{\tilde{g}} - c_0) - c_1 + b^{-1}(x_g - c_0)) \geq (\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}} - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g)$$

  and since all the terms in these inequalities are positive, the statement follows.
- Next, we consider the case where $g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_0+\rho b)} \cap \mathcal{D}$ and $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_1-\rho,c_1]} \cap \mathcal{D}$, which holds since $x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g \geq (c_1 - c_0 - \rho(b+1))$ while $(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}} - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g) \leq \rho$ and ρ_0 may be assumed smaller if necessary.
- Finally, we consider the case where $g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0+\rho b, c_1-\rho)} \cap \mathcal{D}$ and $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_1-\rho,c_1]} \cap \mathcal{D}$, where $x_{\tilde{g}} = \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}}$ and $x_g \leq c_1 - \rho$, which gives $(x_g - x_{\tilde{g}}) \geq (\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}}) \geq 0$.

This proves (3.10), which combined with (3.9) implies (3.7).

Part 2:
To prove (3.8), let $g \in \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_1-2b\rho)} \cap (\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}})^{\mathrm{in}}$. Then one of the following two cases are satisfied:

- There exists a $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}_1(g)$ with $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0+2b\rho, c_1-2b\rho)} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$, which by proposition 3.9 (c) implies that $V(x_{\tilde{g}}) - V(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}}) \geq \beta > 0$.
- There exists a $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}_1(g)$ with $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_0+2b\rho)} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$ while $g \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_1-2b\rho,c_1]} \cap \mathcal{D}$. It then follows that $(x_g - x_{\tilde{g}}) \geq (c_1 - c_0 - 4b\rho)$ and $|\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}}| \leq \rho$, since for all $g \in D$, $\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g \in [c_1-\rho, c_1]$.

This implies together with (3.9), (3.10) and the considerations above, that for every $g \in \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}^{[c_0,c_1-2b\rho)} \cap (\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}})^{\mathrm{in}}$ there exists a $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$, such that $(1/4(|\nabla_{\tilde{g}}(x)|^2 - |\nabla_{\tilde{g}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}})|^2) + V(x_{\tilde{g}}) - V(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}}) \geq S^{-1}\cdot\tilde{k}_1$ for $\tilde{k}_1 := \min\{1,\beta,((c_1-c_0-4b\rho)^2 - \rho^2)/4\} > 0$. Taking into account possible multiplicities of the points g for a specific point $\tilde{g}$ gives us the estimate.

Part 3:
Let $g \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}$. By (3.9)

$$\sum_{g\in\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}} \frac{1}{4}\left(|\nabla_g(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}})|^2 - |\nabla_g(x)|^2\right) \geq W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x)$$

and by part 1, for all $(g,\tilde{g}) \in \mathcal{D}\times\mathcal{D}$ with $d(g,\tilde{g})=1$, $(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}})^2 \leq (x_g - x_{\tilde{g}})^2$ holds. So we only need to consider $(g,\tilde{g}) \in \partial^{\mathrm{in}}\mathcal{D}\times\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D} \cup \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}\times\partial^{\mathrm{in}}\mathcal{D}$, which after reorganising the pairs gives

$$\sum_{g\in\partial^{\mathrm{in}}\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\tilde{g}\in\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}\cap\mathcal{B}_1(g)} \left((\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_g - \tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}_{\tilde{g}})^2 - (x_g - x_{\tilde{g}})^2\right) \geq \sum_{g\in\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}} \frac{1}{4}\left(|\nabla_g(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}})|^2 - |\nabla_g(x)|^2\right),$$

where $\tilde{x}_{\tilde{g}}^{\mathcal{D}} = x_{\tilde{g}}$. We consider first the case where for $(g, \tilde{g}) \in \partial^{\mathrm{in}}\mathcal{D} \times \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}$ either $g \in \mathcal{B}^l$ or $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^l$. If $g \in \mathcal{B}^l$, we use the simple estimate

$$\sum_{\tilde{g}\in\mathcal{B}_1(g)} \Big((\tilde{x}_{\tilde{g}}^{\mathcal{D}} - \tilde{x}_g^{\mathcal{D}})^2 - (x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g)^2\Big) \leq \sum_{\tilde{g}\in\mathcal{B}_1(g)} (x_{\tilde{g}} - \tilde{x}_g^{\mathcal{D}})^2 \leq S(c_1 - c_0)^2 \tag{3.11}$$

and similarly, if $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^l \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}$, we use the same estimate with the roles of $\tilde{g}$ and g reversed. We are left with the case where $g \in \mathcal{B}^h \cap \partial^{\mathrm{in}}\mathcal{D}$, and it holds that either $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^{[c_1-\rho,c_1]}$, which we can forget, since then

$$(\tilde{x}_{\tilde{g}}^{\mathcal{D}} - \tilde{x}_g^{\mathcal{D}})^2 = (x_{\tilde{g}} - (c_1 - \rho))^2 \leq (x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g)^2,$$

or $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{B}^h \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}$. For this second case we observe that

$$(\tilde{x}_g^{\mathcal{D}} - \tilde{x}_{\tilde{g}}^{\mathcal{D}})^2 - (x_{\tilde{g}} - x_g)^2 \leq (\tilde{x}_g^{\mathcal{D}} - \tilde{x}_{\tilde{g}}^{\mathcal{D}})^2 = (c_1 - \rho - x_{\tilde{g}})^2 \leq ((c_1 - x_{\tilde{g}})^2 - \rho^2),$$

which we may by condition (a) from proposition 3.9 estimate by

$$(c_1 - x_{\tilde{g}})^2 - \rho^2 = 2\int_{x_{\tilde{g}}}^{c_1-\rho} (c_1 - y)dy \leq 2m_1^{-1}\int_{x_{\tilde{g}}}^{c_1-\rho} (-V'(y))dy = 2m_1^{-1}(V(x_{\tilde{g}}) - V(c_1 - \rho)).$$

Together with (3.11) this gives with $\tilde{k}_2 := \max\{S(c_1 - c_0)^2, 2Sm_1^{-1}\}$ the inequality

$$\tilde{k}_2\Big(\#(\mathcal{B}^l \cap \partial^{\mathrm{f}}\mathcal{D}) + \sum_{g\in\mathcal{B}^h\cap\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}} (V(x_g) - V(c_1 - \rho))\Big) \geq W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(\tilde{x}^{\mathcal{D}}) - W_{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}\setminus\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{in}}}(x).$$

□

Note that for $\rho \to 0$, it follows since the absolute minima c_0 and c_1 are non-degenerate that then also $\beta \to 0$, where β is as in proposition 3.9. This in turn implies that the constant $\tilde{k}_1$ from the proof above converges to zero with ρ, and so $k_0 \to \infty$ for $\rho \to 0$.

We call a set of vertices $\mathcal{D} \subset G$ connected, if there exists a corresponding connected subset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \subset \Gamma$ such that $\mathcal{D} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ and such that $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \cap G = \mathcal{D}$. (We view edges as open intervals and adding the adjoining vertices corresponds to closing the intervals.)

Lemma 3.11. *Let x be a minimiser on a finite set $\mathcal{B}$ satisfying the boundary conditions given by a function $f : G\setminus\mathcal{B} \to [c_0, c_1]$ and let the sets $\mathcal{B}^l, \mathcal{B}^h$ be as in lemma 3.10. Then for every connected component $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{B}^l$,*

$$\mathcal{D} \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B} \neq \varnothing.$$

Proof. Assume that there is a connected component $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{B}^l$ which does not intersect the boundary $\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}$. Then $x_g \in [c_1 - 2b\rho, c_1]$ on $\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{D}$.

Recall the definition of $\tilde{\rho}$ from proposition 3.9 and define a variation $\tilde{x}$ of x on $\mathcal{D}^0$ by

$$\tilde{x}_g := \min\Big\{c_1, \frac{2b\rho}{(c_1 - c_0 + \tilde{\rho} + 2b\rho)}((c_1 - 2b\rho) - x_g) + (c_1 - 2b\rho)\Big\}.$$

Intuitively, this is a reflexion of x over $c_1 - 2b\rho$ with a contracting factor $\frac{2b\rho}{(c_1-c_0+\tilde{\rho}+2b\rho)} < 1$ (by part (d) of proposition 3.9).

It holds that $\tilde{x}_g \in [c_1 - 2b\rho, c_1]$ for all $g \in \mathcal{D}$. More precisely, it holds that $\tilde{x}_g \in [c_1 - 2b\rho, c_1)$ for all $g \in \mathcal{D}^{(c_0+\tilde{\rho},c_1-2b\rho]}$ and $\tilde{x}_g = c_1$ for all $g \in \mathcal{D}^{[c_0,c_0+\tilde{\rho}]}$. It follows by part (d) of proposition 3.9 that $V(x_g) \geq V(\tilde{x}_g)$ for all g and, since $\frac{2b\rho}{(c_1-c_0+\tilde{\rho}+2b\rho)} < 1$, it also holds that $|\nabla_g(x)|^2 > |\nabla_g(\tilde{x})|^2$ whenever $\nabla_g(x) \neq \nabla_g(\tilde{x})$. This implies that $W_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{out}}}(x) > W_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{out}}}(\tilde{x})$ whenever $\tilde{x} \neq x$. By the definition of $\mathcal{B}^l$ this is indeed the case, which gives us a contradiction. □

4 Controlling the asymptotics

4.1 Main lemma

Let b, ρ_0 be as in proposition 3.9 and fix a constant $\rho \in (0, \rho_0]$, which gives the notion of sets $\mathcal{B}_N^h, \mathcal{B}_N^l$, defined as in lemma 3.10 for balls $\mathcal{B}_N$. In this section we prove the main technical result about how these sets behave when N goes to infinity.

Definition 4.1. Let us recall the definition of the growth rate D from (2.4) and define for $r > 0$ and $\xi_0 \in \partial\Gamma$ the following objects:

- The sequences $r_i \to r$ and $d_i \to 0$ for $i \geq 1$ by

$$r_i := \frac{6r}{\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^{i} \frac{1}{j^2} \quad \text{and} \quad d_i := r_{i+1} - r_i = \frac{6r}{\pi^2 (i+1)^2} \ . \tag{4.12}$$

- For a given natural number n_1 the increasing sequence of real numbers

$$n_{i+1} := \left(\frac{D + 1/2}{D + 1/4} \right) n_i = \left(\frac{D + 1/2}{D + 1/4} \right)^{i-1} n_1 \ . \tag{4.13}$$

- For r_i and n_i as above

$$\mathcal{V}_i := (\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_{i+1}}(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_i}(\xi_0)}) \backslash \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor n_i \rfloor} \ . \tag{4.14}$$

  where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor function.

Remark 4.2. Let r_i, n_i and $\mathcal{V}_i$ be as in the definition above. Recall the definition of the constant t_n from lemma 2.9 and rewrite it for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$t_n = 4k_1^{-1} e^{-\varepsilon n} \quad \text{where} \quad k_1 := (4 \min\{C_2, 4\varepsilon^{-1} e^{4\varepsilon}\})^{-1}. \tag{4.15}$$

Moreover, recall from lemma 2.9 the sets $\mathcal{A}_{r,t_n}$ given by $A^{t_n}_{r+2t_n}(\xi_0) \subset \partial\Gamma$, which "separate" $\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r}(\xi_0)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\Gamma \backslash B^{\varepsilon}_{r+4t_n}(\xi_0)}$ outside $\mathcal{B}_n$. Using definitions (4.14) and (4.15) we may, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, write the set $\mathcal{V}_i$ as a disjoint union $\mathcal{V}_i = \bigsqcup_{j \in I_i} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}$, where the sets $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}$ satisfy $\mathcal{A}_{r_{i_j}, t_{\lfloor n_i \rfloor}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}$. It follows from definitions of r_i and t_n that

$$\#I_i \geq \left\lfloor \frac{k_1 d_i}{e^{-\varepsilon \lfloor n_i \rfloor}} \right\rfloor - 1 \geq k_1 d_i e^{-\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon n_i} - 2. \tag{4.16}$$

The size of I_i measures the number of disjoint separating sets outsize a ball of radius $\lfloor n_i \rfloor$ that are contained in $\mathcal{V}_i$. Note the exponential growth of $\#I_i$ with n_i.

Lemma 4.3 (Main lemma)**.** *Let $r > 0$ and $\xi_0 \in \partial\Gamma$ be given and let C_D, C_0, k_0 and k_1 come from (2.4), the isoperimetric inequality (IP), lemma 3.10 and (4.15), respectively. Define k_2 by*

$$k_2 := \max\{C_D, (6k_0 C_D C_0)^{(\frac{4D+1}{4D})}\}. \tag{4.17}$$

Let furthermore r_i, n_i and $\mathcal{V}_i$ be as in definition 4.1, where n_1 is a real number satisfying

$$n_1 \geq k_3 := \max\left\{ \ 4(4D+1)\varepsilon^{-1} \ , \ \frac{2}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{(k_2 + 2C_D) 4\pi^2}{6r C_D k_1 e^{-\varepsilon}} \right) \right\}. \tag{4.18}$$

Then, whenever there exist for a minimiser x^N on $\mathcal{B}_N$ an $n_i \leq N$ satisfying

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^h_N}(x^N, c_1 - \rho) \geq k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D + \frac{1}{4}) n_i}, \tag{4.19}$$

it follows for all integers $\iota \geq i$ with $n_\iota < N$ that

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_\iota}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_\iota}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^h_N}(x^N, c_1 - \rho) \geq k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D + \frac{1}{4}) n_\iota}.$$

Proof. By inclusion, (4.19) holds for all $j \in I_i$ where I_i is as in remark 4.2 the index set that gives r_{i_j} and $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}$ and for which $\mathcal{V}_i = \bigsqcup_{j \in I_i} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}$. In case that one of the two terms on the left in (4.19) is smaller than one, we may compensate that term in the constants on the right and work only with the other term from here on. Otherwise, observe that for all $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ and $a, b \geq 1$,

$$a^\alpha + b \geq a^\alpha + b^\alpha \geq (a+b)^\alpha.$$

By raising (4.19) to the power $\frac{4D}{4D+1}$ and by (4.17) we thus conclude that

$$\left(\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) \right)^{\frac{4D}{4D+1}} + \left(P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^{\varepsilon}_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^h_N}(x^N, c_1 - \rho) \right) \geq 6k_0 C_D C_0 e^{\varepsilon D n_i}.$$

By the isoperimetric inequality (IP) and since $C_0 \geq 1$ it follows:

$$\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^h_N}(x^N, c_1 - \rho) \geq 6k_0 C_D e^{\varepsilon D n_i}.$$

Since $(\mathcal{B}^l_N)^{\mathrm{out}} = \mathcal{B}^l_N \cup \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}^l_N$, the following estimates hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N)) \leq \\
\leq &\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)} \cap (\mathcal{B}^l_N)^{\mathrm{out}}) + \#((\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)})^{\mathrm{out}} \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}^l_N) \\
\leq &\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + 2\#((\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)})^{\mathrm{out}} \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}^l_N).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Thus

$$\#(\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + (*) \geq 6k_0 C_D e^{\varepsilon D n_i},$$

where

$$(*) := 2\#((\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)})^{\mathrm{out}} \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}^l_N) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^h_N}(x^N, c_1 - \rho).$$

By lemma 2.9 $\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor n_i \rfloor}$ and thus by (2.4)

$$\#(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + (*) \geq C_D(6k_0 - 1)e^{\varepsilon D n_i}.$$

We estimate $(*)$ from above by lemma 3.10 and obtain

$$2k_0\Big(\#(\mathcal{B}^l_N \cap \partial^{\mathrm{f}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)})^{(3\,\mathrm{out})}) + P_{\mathcal{B}^h \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)})^{(3\,\mathrm{out})}}(x, c_1 - \rho)\Big) \geq (*).$$

By lemma 2.9 $\partial^{\mathrm{f}}(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i_j}}(\xi_0)})^{(3\,\mathrm{out})}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\lfloor n_i \rfloor}$ and for small enough $\rho_0 > 0$, proposition 3.9 gives

$$P_{\mathcal{B}^h \cap \mathcal{B}_{n_i}}(x, c_1 - \rho) \leq \#\mathcal{B}_{n_i}(V(c_1 - 2b\rho) - V(c_1 - \rho)) \leq \#\mathcal{B}_{n_i},$$

so by (2.4)

$$(2k_0 + 1)\#(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + 2k_0 P_{\mathcal{B}^h \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}}(x, c_1 - \rho) + 4C_D k_0 \geq C_D(6k_0 - 1)e^{\varepsilon D n_i}. \tag{4.21}$$

Since it is clear from the proof of lemma 3.10 that $k_0 \geq 1$, it holds

$$\#(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + P_{\mathcal{B}^h \cap \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}}(x, c_1 - \rho) \geq C_D e^{\varepsilon D n_i}.$$

It follows from $\mathcal{V}_i = \bigsqcup_{j \in I_i} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i_j}$ and (4.16) that

$$\Big(\#(\mathcal{V}_i \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N) + P_{\mathcal{V}_i \cap \mathcal{B}^h_N}(x^N, c_1 - \rho)\Big) \geq \frac{C_D 6 r k_1 e^{-\varepsilon}}{\pi^2 (i+1)^2} e^{\varepsilon(D+1)n_i} - 2C_D e^{\varepsilon D n_i} =: (\star). \tag{4.22}$$

Rewriting the right-hand side by

$$(\star) = C_D\left(\frac{6 r k_1 e^{-\varepsilon}}{\pi^2 (i+1)^2} e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_i}{2}} - 2e^{-\varepsilon \frac{n_i}{2}}\right) e^{\varepsilon(D + \frac{1}{2})n_i}$$

we use the definition of n_{i+1} in (4.13) to write $(D + 1/4)n_{i+1} = (D + 1/2)n_i$ and obtain

$$(\star) = C_D\left(\frac{6 r k_1 e^{-\varepsilon}}{\pi^2 (i+1)^2} e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}\left(\frac{D+1/2}{D+1/4}\right)^{i-1}} - 2\right) e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})n_{i+1}}. \tag{4.23}$$

Let $a := (1 + 4D)^{-1} > 0$, so that $\left(\frac{D+1/2}{D+1/4}\right) = 1 + a$ and estimate

$$\frac{1}{(i+1)^2} e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}(1+a)^{i-1}} \geq e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}}\left(\frac{e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}(i-1)a}}{(i+1)^2}\right).$$

By condition (4.18), we chose n_1 large enough that

$$\frac{6 r C_D k_1 e^{-\varepsilon}}{\pi^2} e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}} - 2C_D \geq k_2.$$

Observe that the function $(1+x)^{-2}e^{\beta(x-1)}$ is monotone increasing for all $x \geq 0$, whenever $\beta \geq 2$. In particular, since $n_1 \geq 4(4D+1)\varepsilon^{-1}$, it follows that $a\varepsilon n_1 > 4$, so for all $j \geq 1$

$$\frac{e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}(j-1)a}}{(j+1)^2} \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Hence, it follows from inequality (4.22) by (4.23) and by condition (4.18)

$$(\star) \geq C_D \left(6r\pi^{-2}k_1 e^{-\varepsilon} e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}} \left(\frac{e^{\varepsilon \frac{n_1}{2}(i-1)\alpha}}{(i+1)^2} \right) - 2 \right) e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})n_{i+1}} \geq k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})n_{i+1}}.$$

Since $(\mathcal{V}_i \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l) \subset (\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_{i+1}}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l)$ we have proved the statement of the lemma for $\iota = i+1$ and we obtain the full statement by induction. □

With this lemma we easily obtain the following corollary:

Corollary 4.4. *Let $B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0) \subset D_1$ be a ball at infinity, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let x^N be minimisers solving the minimisation problems defined in proposition 3.8 and let k_2 and k_3 be as in the main lemma above. Then*

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l) \leq \bar{n},$$

where

$$\bar{n} := \lceil k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{2})k_3} \rceil$$

and $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ denotes the ceiling function

Proof. Assume that the corollary is not true and let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be any fixed number larger than k_3. It is easy to see that there exists a real number

$$n_1 \in \Big[k_3, \Big(\frac{D+1/2}{D+1/4} \Big) k_3 \Big],$$

such that $n_i = N$ for some $i \geq 1$. It then follows

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l) \geq k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})n_1}$$

and since $n_1 \geq k_3$, it holds by lemma 4.3, that for every $j \geq 1$

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_j}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_j}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^h}(x, c_1 - \rho) \geq k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})n_j}$$

and in particular

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^h}(x, c_1 - \rho) \geq k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})n_i} = k_2 e^{\varepsilon(D+\frac{1}{4})N}.$$

On the other hand, as in (4.21), (2.4) gives

$$\#(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l) + P_{\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_i}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^h}(x, c_1 - \rho) \leq \#\mathcal{B}_N \leq C_D e^{\varepsilon D N},$$

which is a contradiction, since $k_2 \geq C_D$. □

4.2 Proof of the Existence theorem

In this section we prove the main theorem. Its proof is basically contained in the following two lemmas. The first is a rather direct consequence of corollary 4.4 and lemma 3.11. It implies that when $B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0) \subset D_1$, the values of minimisers x^N on $\mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\text{ in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}$ are uniformly close to c_1.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_0) \subset D_1$ and x^N for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be minimisers solving the corresponding minimisation problems defined in proposition 3.8. Then it holds for $\bar{n}$ defined in corollary 4.4 that*

$$\mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\text{ in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}_N^l = \varnothing.$$

Proof. Assume that the lemma is not true, i.e. there exists a $g \in \mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\,\mathrm{in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N$. By lemma 3.11, there exists a point $\tilde{g} \in \partial^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathcal{B}^l_N \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}_N)$ and a path $p_{g,\tilde{g}} \subset \Gamma$ from g to $\tilde{g}$, with $(p_{g,\tilde{g}} \cap G) \subset \mathcal{B}^l_N$. Since $\partial^{\mathrm{out}}(\mathcal{B}^l_N \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}_N) = (\mathcal{C}_{D_1})^c \cap \partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{B}_N$ and because $B^\varepsilon_r(\xi_0) \subset \mathring{D}_1$, the path $p_{g,\tilde{g}}$ intersects $\partial^{\mathrm{out}}\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}$ and it follows that

$$\#(\mathcal{B}^l_N \cap \mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}) \geq \#(p_{g,\tilde{g}} \cap \mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}) \geq \bar{n}.$$

This contradicts the statement of corollary 4.4. □

The following lemma states that for every $r > 0$ there exists an $\tilde{n} \in \mathtt{N}$, such that the set $\mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\,\mathrm{in})}_{B^\varepsilon_r(\xi_0)}$ contains the truncated cone $\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r/2}(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{\tilde{n}}$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $B^\varepsilon_r(\xi_0)$ be a ball at infinity, r_1 as in (4.12) and define $r_0 := r_1/2$. Then it holds for $\bar{n}$ defined in corollary 4.4 that*

$$\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_0}(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{2\bar{n}} \subset \mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\,\mathrm{in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}.$$

Proof. Let $\bar{n}$ be as above and m be an integer such that $m \geq \bar{n}$. It follows by the definition of cones that if $g \in \mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_0}(\xi_0)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_m$, then $S(g) \subset B^\varepsilon_{r_0}(\xi_0)$. Let $\tilde{\xi} \in S(g)$ and let $\tilde{g} \in \tilde{\xi}_v$, such that $|\tilde{g}| = \bar{n}$. Then, by proposition 2.5, $S(\tilde{g}) \subset B^\varepsilon_{r_0 + C_2 e^{-\varepsilon\bar{n}}}(\xi_0)$. Let now $h \in (\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)})^c \cup \mathcal{B}_{\bar{n}}$. We will show that $d(g,h) \geq m - \bar{n}$. In case that $h \in \mathcal{B}_{\bar{n}}$, by the triangle inequality $d(g,h) \geq m - \bar{n}$. Assume now that $h \in (\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)} \cup \mathcal{B}_{\bar{n}})^c$. Then $|h| \geq \bar{n}$ and there exists a $\xi \in S(h)$ such that $\xi \notin B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)$. Let $\tilde{h} \in \xi_v$ be such that $|\tilde{h}| = \bar{n}$. It holds that $d^\varepsilon(\xi, \tilde{\xi}) \geq r_0 - C_2 e^{-\varepsilon\bar{n}}$ and it follows since $\bar{n} \geq k_3$ and by (4.18) that $\bar{n} \geq \varepsilon^{-1}\log(\pi^2 r^{-1})$, so $C_2 e^{-\varepsilon\bar{n}} \leq r_1/6$ and

$$\frac{1}{2}(r_0 - C_2 e^{-\varepsilon\bar{n}}) \geq C_2 e^{-\varepsilon\bar{n}}.$$

By proposition 2.5 it then follows that $S(\tilde{g}) \cap S(\tilde{h}) = \varnothing$ and in particular that $(\mathcal{U}_\xi \cap \mathcal{U}_{\tilde{\xi}}) \backslash \mathcal{B}_{\bar{n}} = \varnothing$, so $d(\tilde{g}, \tilde{h}) \geq 2\delta$. It then easily follows by δ-hyperbolicity that

$$d(g,h) \geq m - \bar{n}.$$

Setting $m = 2\bar{n}$, it holds that $d(g,h) \geq \bar{n}$, which implies that $g \in \mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\,\mathrm{in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}$ and finishes the proof.

□

Now we are ready to prove the existence theorem stated in the introduction. Let us rephrase it slightly, before proving it:

Theorem (Existence of asymptotically defined minimizers). *Let $j \in \{0,1\}$ and $\xi_j \in \mathring{D}_j$ be a point at infinity, let $r > 0$ be such that $B^\varepsilon_r(\xi_j) \subset D_j$, $r_0 = \frac{3r}{\pi^2}$, and let $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists a constant $n_0 \in \mathtt{N}$, such that for all $N \geq n_0$ and for all $g \in \mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_0}(\xi_j)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{n_0}$,*

$$|x^N_g - c_j| \leq \varepsilon.$$

In particular, the global minimiser $\bar{x} = \lim_{k\to\infty} x^{N_k}$ constructed in proposition 3.8 solves the minimal Cauchy problem at infinity given by D_0 and D_1 (see definition 3.7).

Proof. As in the discussion above, let us first consider the case where $j = 1$. Given an $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\rho := \min\{\rho_0, \varepsilon/2b\}$, $r_1 = 2r_0$ as in (4.12), and $n_0 = 2\bar{n}$ as in corollary 4.4. Then it holds by lemma 4.6 that $\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_0}(\xi_j)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{n_0} \subset \mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\,\mathrm{in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)}$ and by lemma 4.5 that for all $N \geq n_0$, $\mathcal{C}^{(\bar{n}\,\mathrm{in})}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_1}(\xi_0)} \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N = \varnothing$, so

$$(\mathcal{C}_{B^\varepsilon_{r_0}(\xi_j)} \backslash \mathcal{B}_{n_0}) \cap \mathcal{B}^l_N = \varnothing.$$

This implies the statement of the theorem for $j = 1$ by the definition of $\mathcal{B}^l_N$ from lemma 3.10. For the case $j = 0$, an analogous proof can be followed, starting from proposition 3.9 with c_0 and c_1 in the definitions appropriately exchanged. □

A The Assouad dimension and growth of the graph

In this section, we prove proposition 2.1, i.e. we show that the growth of balls is bounded by an exponential related to the Assouad dimension of $\partial\Gamma$. We assume throughout this appendix that ε corresponding to a visual metric on Γ is fixed, which makes $\partial\Gamma$ into a metric space.

Denote for any $B \subset \partial\Gamma$ by $N_r(B)$ the smallest number of open sets of diameter r required to cover B. The Assouad dimension of $\partial\Gamma$ is then defined by

$$d_A(\partial\Gamma) := \inf\Big\{D \geq 0 \mid \exists C, \rho > 0 : \forall 0 < r < R \leq \rho, \sup_{\xi\in\partial\Gamma} N_r(B_R^\varepsilon(\xi)) \leq C\Big(\frac{R}{r}\Big)^D\Big\} \quad \text{(A.24)}$$

We refer the reader to [15, Chapter 10] for an introduction to the Assouad dimension and its properties. Since Γ is locally uniformly bounded it follows from [5, Theorem 9.2] that the Assouad dimension of $\partial\Gamma$ is finite. As explained in [15, Chapters 10], this is equivalent to the fact that (Γ, d_ε) is doubling as a metric space, i.e. there exists a number M_d, such that for every $r > 0$ and $\xi_0 \in \partial\Gamma$, there exist $\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_k\}$ for $k \leq M_d$, such that

$$B_{2r}^\varepsilon(\xi_0) \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^k B_r^\varepsilon(\xi_i). \quad \text{(A.25)}$$

Now we are ready to prove proposition 2.1:

Proposition 2.1 (Growth of balls)**.** *For every $D > d_A(\partial\Gamma)$ there exists a constant C_D, such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\#\mathcal{B}_n \leq C_D e^{\varepsilon D n}.$$

Proof. It follows directly from the definition of the Assouad dimension that for every $D > d_A(\partial\Gamma)$ and $r < \rho$, $N_r(B_\rho^\varepsilon(\xi)) \leq C\rho^D r^{-D}$. Since $\partial\Gamma$ is bounded, by say R_0, we may replace ρ in this inequality by R_0. Indeed, it holds for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ that $2^k\rho \geq R_0$ and by the doubling condition

$$N_r(B_{R_0}^\varepsilon(\xi)) \leq M_d^k N_r(B_\rho^\varepsilon(\xi)) \leq M_d^k C\rho^D r^{-D}.$$

Let $s_n := C_1 e^{-\varepsilon n}$, so that $N_{s_n}(B_{R_0}^\varepsilon(\xi)) \leq M_d^k C 2^D \rho^D e^{\varepsilon D n}$. Since there exists a covering of $\partial\Gamma$ by $M_d^k C 2^D \rho^D e^{\varepsilon D n}$ sets of diameter s_n, there also exists a covering of $\partial\Gamma$ by the same number of balls $B_{s_n}^\varepsilon(\xi_i)$. By proposition 2.5 it holds that for every $g \in \mathcal{S}_n \cap \xi_v$, where $\mathcal{S}_n$ is the sphere of radius n in G and $\xi \in \partial\Gamma$, the shadow $S(g)$ has diameter bounded from below by $2C_1 e^{\varepsilon n}$. Hence, there exists also a covering by shadows $S(g_i)$ with $g_i \in \mathcal{S}_n \cap (\xi_i)_v$ of size at most $M_d^k C\rho^D e^{\varepsilon D n}$. This means that every ray class ξ_v passing through $\mathcal{S}_n$ is within a δ distance to one of g_i's and furthermore, since Γ is visual, that every g is δ-close to a ray. It follows by local uniform boundedness condition on Γ, that there exists a uniform constant $\tilde{k}$, such that for every $g \in G$, $\#\mathcal{B}_{2\delta}(g_i) \leq \tilde{k}$ holds and it follows that $\#\mathcal{S}_n \leq \tilde{k} M^k C\rho^D 2^D e^{\varepsilon D n}$. The statement of the proposition now easily follows for an appropriately defined C_D by

$$\#\mathcal{B}_n \leq \sum_{l=1}^n \#\mathcal{S}_l \leq \tilde{k} M^k C\rho^D e^{\varepsilon D n} \sum_{k=1}^n e^{\varepsilon D k} \leq C_D e^{\varepsilon D n}.$$

□

References

[1] J.M. Alonso, T. Brady, D. Cooper, V. Ferlini, M. Lustig, M. Mihalik, M. Shapiro, and H. Short, *Notes on word hyperbolic groups*, Group theory from a geometrical viewpoint (Trieste, 1990), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1991, pp. 3–63.

[2] A. Ancona, *Théorie du potentiel sur les graphes et les variétés*, École d'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XVIII—1988, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1427, Springer, Berlin, 1990, pp. 1–112.

[3] M.T. Anderson, *The Dirichlet problem at infinity for manifolds of negative curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **18** (1983), no. 4, 701–721 (1984).

[4] I. Birindelli and R. Mazzeo, *Symmetry for solutions of two-phase semilinear elliptic equations on hyperbolic space*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **58** (2009), no. 5, 2347–2368.

[5] M. Bonk and O. Schramm, *Embeddings of Gromov hyperbolic spaces*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **10** (2000), no. 2, 266–306.

[6] D. Calegari, *The ergodic theory of hyperbolic groups*, Geometry and topology down under, Contemp. Math., vol. 597, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013, pp. 15–52.

[7] A. Candel and R. de la Llave, *On the Aubry-Mather theory in statistical mechanics*, Commun. Math. Phys. **192** (1998), no. 3, 649–669.

[8] H.I. Choi, *Asymptotic Dirichlet problems for harmonic functions on Riemannian manifolds*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **281** (1984), no. 2, 691–716.

[9] M. Coornaert, *Mesures de Patterson-Sullivan sur le bord d'un espace hyperbolique au sens de Gromov*, Pacific J. Math. **159** (1993), no. 2, 241–270.

[10] M. Coornaert, T. Delzant, and A. Papadopoulos, *Géométrie et théorie des groupes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1441, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.

[11] T. Coulhon, *Random walks and geometry on infinite graphs*, Lecture notes on analysis in metric spaces (Trento, 1999), Appunti Corsi Tenuti Docenti Sc., Scuola Norm. Sup., Pisa, 2000, pp. 5–36.

[12] P. de la Harpe, *Topics in geometric group theory*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2000.

[13] M. Gromov, *Hyperbolic groups*, Essays in group theory, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., vol. 8, Springer, New York, 1987, pp. 75–263.

[14] ———, *Asymptotic invariants of infinite groups*, Geometric group theory, Vol. 2 (Sussex, 1991), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 182, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 1–295.

[15] J. Heinonen, *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.

[16] I. Holopainen, U. Lang, and A. Vähäkangas, *Dirichlet problem at infinity on Gromov hyperbolic metric measure spaces*, Math. Ann. **339** (2007), no. 1, 101–134.

[17] I. Kapovich and N. Benakli, *Boundaries of hyperbolic groups*, Combinatorial and geometric group theory (New York, 2000/Hoboken, NJ, 2001), Contemp. Math., vol. 296, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002, pp. 39–93.

[18] H. Koch, R. de la Llave, and C. Radin, *Aubry-Mather theory for functions on lattices*, Discr. Cont. Dyn. Syst. **3** (1997), no. 1, 135–151.

[19] R. Mazzeo and M. Saez, *Multiple-layer solutions to the Allen-Cahn equation on hyperbolic space*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **142** (2014), no. 8, 2859–2869.

[20] B. Mramor, *Minimisers of the allen-cahn equation and the asymptotic plateau problem on hyperbolic groups*, (preprint, 2015).

[21] A. Pisante and M. Ponsiglione, *Phase transitions and minimal hypersurfaces in hyperbolic space*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **36** (2011), no. 5, 819–849.

[22] D. Sullivan, *The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1979), no. 50, 171–202.

[23] ———, *The Dirichlet problem at infinity for a negatively curved manifold*, J. Differential Geom. **18** (1983), no. 4, 723–732 (1984).